

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 are pending in the present application. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 have been amended and Claims 1-6, and 9 have been cancelled by the present amendment. No new matter has been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicant's representative on November 1, 2005. During the interview, the various 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections were discussed as well as the Takehara and Narendra references. In particular, the Claim 1 term "external" was discussed in view of the new matter rejection as well as the prior art rejection of Claim 2-4.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a); Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to satisfy the enablement requirements, and written description; Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,480,231 to Takehara (hereinafter "Takehara"); and Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,518,833 to Narendra et al.

Applicant notes, with appreciation, the indication of allowable subject matter with regard to dependent Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11. In response to the indication of allowable subject matter, Applicant has rewritten Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 in independent form.

Regarding the objection to Applicant's specification under 35 U.S.C. 132(a), Applicant has deleted the recitations regarding the "exterior" limitation. The objection is therefore moot.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement, Applicant has amended the current claims by deleting the "varies" feature. The rejection is therefore moot.

In response to the rejection of Claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite, applicant has amended Claim 7 to clarify that the first current electrode of the fifth transistor is connected to the second and third current mirror circuits, respectively. In view of these claims amendments, no further rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is anticipated.

Consequently, as all outstanding issues are believed to be addressed by the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

W. Todd Baker.
Registration No. 45,265

I:\ATTY\WTB\2524\244342US\AMENDMENT 13 JAN 2006.DOC